

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 21 December 2000 with thirteen claims, two of which were written in independent form. No claims have been allowed.

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,310,650 to Johnson et al. ("Johnson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,485,279 to Yonemitsu et al. ("Yonemitsu"). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner stated, "Johnson discloses, . . . Correcting said test image to remove DMD mirror tilt angle non-uniformities from said test image, . . . (note fig. 8 block 206, the examiner interprets non-desirable characteristic as non-uniformities, captured image identifies transformation function to correct and remove non-uniformities)."

Johnson teaches, "In accordance with the above, FIG. 8 shows a flow diagram of an illustrative method for calibrating a display. The algorithm is entered at element 200, and control is passed to element 202. Element 202 captures a capture image of at least a portion of the composite image on a screen. Control is then passed to element 204. Element 204 determines if the capture image has one or more non-desirable characteristics. Control is then passed to element 206. Element 206 identifies a transformation function that can be used to process an input video signal and provide a processed input video signal to selected projectors to reduce the non-desirable characteristics. Control is then passed to element 208, wherein the algorithm is exited."

The Examiner has failed to indicate any teaching in Johnson or Yonemitsu that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Johnson which teaches processing an input video signal to selected projectors to reduce the non-desirable characteristics into any suggestion to correct a captured test image "to remove DMD mirror tilt angle non-uniformities from said test image" as recited by Claim 1. Without such a teaching or suggestion, the Examiner's rejection is defective and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6, 8, and 9 depend from Claims 1 and 7 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits.

Claims 10-13 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner stated Claims 10-13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all

of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of the base claim and should now be deemed allowable.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418